IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CRIMINAL APPLICATION No 761 of 2001

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE A.M.KAPADIA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

NAGINBHAI NAROTTAMBHAI PARMAR

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

1. Special Criminal Application No. 761 of 2001

MS ROOPA SREEDHAR for Petitioner No. 1

MR KT DAVE APP for Respondents

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE A.M.KAPADIA

Date of decision: 02/11/2001

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. In this petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution, petitioner has challenged the order dated May 3, 2001 Annexure A to the petition, passed by the Sub Divisional Magistrate, Vadodara, by which he has externed

the petitioner for a period of two years from five districts, i.e., Vadodara City, Vadodara District, Bharuch, Anand, Narmada and Panchmahal Districts and also the order dated July ..., 2001, Annexure C to the petition, passed by the appellate authority, confirming the order of externment passed by the externing authority, and prayed to quash and set aside both the above mentioned orders.

2. A show cause notice dated October 3, 2000, Annexure B to the petition, under Section 59 of the Bombay Police Act ('the Act' for short) was issued to the petitioner in which four allegations were made against him to the effect that he is a strong headed quarrelsome and aggressive person, not doing any work, picking up quarrel in trifle disputes, committing breach of peace, giving threats to the people of that area, identify himself as a criminal of that area (Dada), keeping weapons, continues his anti-social activities by which he is causing physical and financial damage to the people and the people are afraid of filing complaint against him and the activities carried out by him are detrimental to the maintenance of public order. Besides this, four cases also were registered against him at Karjan Police Station for various offences under the Indian Penal Code. Therefore, by the show cause notice, the petitioner was called upon to show cause as to why he should not be externed from the above mentioned five districts.

3. The petitioner gave reply to the show cause notice. The externing authority, after considering the reply submitted by the petitioner and other material on record, passed the impugned order of externment dated May 3, 2001 by externing the petitioner for a period of two years from the above mentioned five districts in exercise of powers conferred under section 56 (a) of the Act.

5. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid order passed by the externing authority, the petitioner preferred an appeal and the appellate authority by order dated July...., 2001, Annexure C to the petition, dismissed the appeal filed by the petitioner which has given rise to the present petition.

6. Ms. Roopa Sreedhar, learned advocate for the petitioner has raised several contentions and tried to convince the Court that the order of externment suffers from various vices much less it is passed in clear non-application of mind. Besides this, she has also raised the contention that the petitioner is a resident of Shimli village of Karjan Taluka of Vadodara District

but he is externed not only from Vadodara District but from other four districts also. She also contended that the alleged so-called activities of the petitioner which are narrated in the show cause notice are confined to the jurisdiction of Karjan Police station of Vadodara District only and the externing authority has not mentioned anything about the activities of the petitioner in the contiguous four districts including Vadodara City. She, therefore, urged that the impugned order of externment suffers from the vices of non-application of mind and is, therefore, liable to be quashed and set aside.

7. Mr. K.T. Dave, learned APP who appears for the respondents has made oral submissions and contested the petition. He contended that the petitioner is a strong headed person and his activities are detrimental to the maintenance of public order. He has involved in four serious criminal offences like offences under Sections 354, 363, 366 and 376 of IPC i.e., offence against women. Therefore, the externing authority has rightly passed the order of externment which is rightly confirmed by the appellate authority. He, therefore, urged to dismiss the petition.

8. I have considered the submissions advanced by the learned advocates for the parties. I have also considered the averments made in the petition, documents annexed with the petition and the impugned orders.

9. It is true that the externing authority has power under section 56 of the Act to remove or extern a person not only from the district within which the externing authority has jurisdiction, but also from the district contiguous to his own district. The criteria for passing such an order is provided for in Section 56 and there must be some indication in the order itself of the existence of circumstances which would lead to the satisfaction of the authority that it was necessary not only to extern a person from his own district but also from the contiguous district. Such circumstances must be qua every area or region from which a person is directed to be externed and there must be some material or indication of such material in the order.

10. Coming to the facts of the present case, there is no manner of doubt that the externing authority has not mentioned either in the show cause notice or in the impugned order of externment as to what necessitated him to pass the order of externment of the petitioner from the above mentioned four districts in addition to

Vadodara District. Therefore, it can be said that at the time of passing of the impugned order of externment, the externing authority has not mentioned as to why the petitioner should be externed from other four districts also in addition to Vadodara District. On this sole ground the orders passed by the externing authority externing the petitioner and that of the appellate authority confirming the order of externment, both are rendered invalid and illegal and deserve to be quashed and set aside.

11. For the foregoing reasons, the petition succeeds and is accordingly allowed. The impugned order of externment passed by the externing authority and the order passed by the appellate authority confirming the externment order, both are quashed and set aside. Rule is made absolute. Direct service is permitted.

(A.M. Kapadia, J.)